



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/982,323	10/18/2001	Richard Dean Dettinger	ROC920010241US1	6608	
75	7590 · 06/16/2005			EXAMINER	
Gero G. McCl	Gero G. McClellan			SAIN, GAUTAM	
Moser, Patterson	n & Sheridan, L.L.P.				
Suite 1500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
3040 Post Oak Boulevard			2176		
Houston, TX 77056-6582			DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005	;	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/982,323	DETTINGER, RICHARD DEAN
Examiner	Art Unit
Gautam Sain	2176

2

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 23 May 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date
of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues, on page 10, that Schulman does not teach, show or suggest that a validity of the "user input information"
is determined against the "at least one menu item". The Examiner disagrees. Shulman teaches "automated assist windows
appear based on a determination of the possible choices that exist in view of the programming language statement characters and/or identifiers immediately preceding the character position cursor. A continuous high-level compilation occurs as each
character in each line of programming language code is entered so that symbols, labels, and names can be instantly resolved
for the immediate programming language statement whether the defined entity being referred to is a local program definition or a global library definition. Alternatively, manually invoked assist windows appear on demand based on a user request."
Applicant also argues on page 10 that Shulman in view of Multiedit does not teach context-sensitive word validity checking in a programming environment in which a validity of the user input information is determined against a plurality of relevant terms
which are generated based on the context of the input locaiton or determined relative to the context. The Examiner disagrees.
The Multiedit (NPL) teaches text in quotes, text in comments from the cursor position at top of tile and continue to end of file
(page 6) and under PowerEditing Feature, Spellchecker - check text in quotes for source code)(page 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shulman to include the spell checking in quotes
or from cursor begin and end position as taught by the Multiedit software.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
I 13 □ Other

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

6.5.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-303 (Rev. 4-05)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 061305

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

6 13/3005